



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V. — *Greek Pronominal Adjectives of the Type ποῖος*

BY PROFESSOR WALTER PETERSEN

BETHANY COLLEGE

WHAT has become in Greek of the I. E. pronominal genitive plural in *-oisōm*, the form found *e.g.* in Skr. *tēsām*, Av. *aē-taēšam*, O.Eng. *ḍāra*, O.Icel. *peira*, O.Blg. *těchъ*, and the existence of which in Oscan-Umbrian is guaranteed by the ablative sing. Osc. *poizad*, Umbr. *pōra*, which is made by analogy to it, and in the Gothic by the adjectival genitives like *blindaišē*?¹ Why should the Greek pronominal *o*-stems not show a single plausible trace either of this original form or some other form showing some remnants of the pronominal declension, as the *s* appears in Lat. *hōrum* and Goth. *pišē*, O. H. G. *dero*? When we consider in how many different languages some traces of this original gen. pl. are found, and how the Greek has otherwise conserved the pronominal forms and even extended them at the expense of the substantival forms, not only in the masc. nom. pl. in *-oi* (*e.g.* *τοί, ἄνθρωποι*), but even forming by analogy the fem. nom. pl. in *-ai* and the dat. pl. in *-αισι*, when we think of the fact, moreover, that the form with which the gen. pl. of the *o*-stems was most intimately associated, *i.e.* the corresponding gen. pl. of the fem. *ā*-stems in *-āsōm*, Gr. *-άων -ῶν* (*e.g.* *τῶν τῶν, χωράων χωρῶν*), and which must therefore have been a strong force in protecting the corresponding masc. forms, not only held its own, but actually encroached on and displaced the substantival ending, we must expect either to find some trace of this widely prevalent form in *-oisōm*, or else to explain its disappearance.

If now there should be in existence some Greek descendant of I. E. *-oisōm*, what form would it have taken? According to the rule that intervocalic sigma dropped, the first stage evidently was *-oίων*. The question is whether this form remained intact or whether the intervocalic iota also dropped and subsequently contraction took place. W. Schulze, *Quaest.*

¹ Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* II, 2², 369 f.

Epic. 61 f., wanted to explain the apparently irregular accent of the Dor. ἀλλῶν by contraction of *ἀλλοίων < *ἀλλοίσων, claiming that the gen. ἵππῳ < *ἵπποισο < *ἵπποσιο was an exact parallel. But the irregular accent of the Dor. gen. pl. is much more simply explained by Osthoff, *Z. G. d. P.* 199 f., and G. Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*³ 520, as patterned after the fem. ἀλλᾶν, just as the Attic fem. τούτων after the masc. And as far as the analogy of the gen. sing. in -οιο is concerned, its derivation from -οσιο through -οισο is itself too uncertain to be used as a support for *ἀλλοίσων > ἀλλῶν. For not only is there no support for the assumption of the intermediate step *ἵπποισο, but all certain evidence points to the stability of the combinations -οιω- and -οιο-. Bechtel, *Vocalcontract.* 138, gives four examples to prove that the diphthongs remaining after the dropping of the sigma in the combinations -αισο- -εισο- -οισο- remain in all of the dialects, of which we are concerned particularly with the second singular opt. φέροιο < *φέροισο. Schulze's assumption (*l.c.*) that ι was analogically reintroduced after other opt. forms like φερούμην, is impossible because φέροιο is not a regular form which could be analyzed into root and suffixes and personal endings, which would be presupposed by the notion of 'Systemszwang,' but the -ο uncontracted appears as ending for the second person sing. only in such optative forms.² There could consequently be no assimilation of these structureless forms to the transparent forms like φερούμην or φέροιτο, and the anomaly of the ending of φέροιο shows distinctly that it is a product of phonetic change.

It appears that the cause of the whole tendency to assume contraction of the above-mentioned combinations comes from the unwillingness to allow a double origin for several functionally identical forms, particularly τελέω τελέω and τελέω,

² I mean that if φέροιο had become *φέρου, the influence of other optative forms could not have resulted in the form φέροιο, because there was no pattern from which the ο could be reintroduced as ending for the second person singular; for in all except the optative forms contraction had also taken place, except where the complete ending -σο was reintroduced after consonant stems. For if φέροιο had contracted to *φέρου, λύσαιο would have become *λύσω, etc.

and the genitives τοῦ and Homeric τοῖο. To explain a few such doublets Schmidt, *K. Z.* xxxviii, 311 ff., had to assume that the *ι* of these diphthongs was dropped when they were enclitic or proclitic (e.g. ἐμείο : *μεο μεν), and when this would not work that it was dropped between two like vowels (e.g. θεοῖο > *θεοο θεοῦ). But aside from the fact that sound changes assumed to account for a few uncertain relationships are never convincing, the latter part of the rule breaks down utterly when we consider that we never find any contraction in the adjectives like ἡοῖος < *ἡόσιος or ποῖος, οἶος, τοῖος,³ etc., in spite of the fact that they are as old as Homer, and that most of the masc. and neuter forms would come under the rule. It is therefore much better with Bechtel to deny further changes of the groups like -οιο- and -οιω-, and rather to assume a different method of formation for τοῖο and τοῦ. As a result it appears that if there is any remnant of the I. E. pronominal gen. pl. ending -οισῶm, it must appear in the Greek as -οίων.

We thus find that if we transliterate the Skr. *tēśām*, gen. pl. of *sá*, into Greek, we get *τοίων*, which looks exactly like the gen. pl. of the pronominal adjective *τοῖος* 'of such kind.' Similarly Skr. *yēśām*, gen. pl. of the relative *yás*, corresponds to Gr. *οἷων* : *οἶος* 'of which kind,' and Skr. *kēśām* : *kás* 'who' to Gr. *ποίων* : *ποῖος* 'of which kind.' This leads us to the question whether we have here merely an accidental resemblance, or a real correspondence, and whether the entire declensional system of *ποῖος*, *οἶος*, and *τοῖος* was formed on the basis of this genitive plural, just as the whole Greek aorist passive system in -θη- may have been built upon a second person singular like ἐδόθη = Skr. *ádi-thās*.⁴ To make the latter alternative probable it will be necessary on the one hand to weigh its probability in comparison with the other theories suggested as to the origin of the type, on the other hand to show what forces were probably operative in isolating these

³ It is true that according to Schulze, e.g., *ποῖος* would have originally been **ποῖφος*, not **ποῖσος*, but since both would have been identical in Homeric times, the resulting development must have been the same regardless of origin.

⁴ Cf., e.g., Hirt, *Handb. d. gr. Laut- u. Formenl.*² 557 f.

genitives from the rest of the paradigm, and particularly to explain the development of the qualitative and adjectival force of the forms in *-oîos* as opposed to the primitives.

As far as Brugmann's suggestion (*Gr. Gr.*³ 181) is concerned, that the pronominal adjectives like *ποῖος* are locatives singular in *-oi* + suffix *-io-*, the objection seems to be fatal that it is impossible to see any connection between the meaning of the locative case and the qualitative meaning which is so characteristic of these adjectives. More recently Brugmann (*Gr.* II, 1², 79, 207) has followed W. Schulze, *Lat. Eigenamen*, 435, who declares *ποῖος*, *οἶος*, and *τοῖος* to have arisen by composition of the pronominal stems *qmo-*, *io-*, *to-* with I. E. **oi̯mo-* 'walk,' comparing the Goth. adverb *hwaīwa* 'how' with *ποῖος*. While this comparison seems enticing to many, and while in the nature of the case it can neither be proven nor disproven, yet it may be said that the partial correspondence of the Gothic adverb with *ποῖος* is far from being as striking as the complete correspondence of the three genitives *ποῖων*, *οἷων*, and *τοῖων*⁵ with forms in the Indo-Iranian, Oscan-Umbrian, Germanic, and Slavic. And as far as the development of meaning is concerned, it will appear below that the qualitative notion is at least as easily developed, if not more so, from the simple non-qualitative pronoun than from a concrete word meaning 'way.' Finally, the balance of probability is in favor of the pronominal genitives, because in this way, *i.e.* by their pronominal origin, is explained why a closely associated group of seven pronominal adjectives (*ποῖος*, *οἶος*, *τοῖος*, *όποῖος*, *άλλοῖος*, *όμοῖος*, *παντοῖος*)⁶ should exist with no spreading to derivatives from nouns, while it is not so easy to see why the derivatives with **oi̯mo-* 'way' should not have been formed from any adjective whatsoever.

The immediate prerequisite for the isolation of the pronominal genitives in *-οἷων* was of course the formation of parallel genitives with the substantival ending *-ων*, which, however,

⁵ Probably, as is seen below *s.v.*, the genitives *άλλοῖων* and *όμοῖων* also had corresponding forms in other I. E. languages.

⁶ That this is the latest of these pronominal adjectives is shown by the fact that it is derived from a consonant stem. See below *s.v.*

needs no proof, because the latter is the actually existing ending for all pronouns as well as nouns, and consequently must be assumed under any theory. What we have to explain, is why the original pronominal genitives came to be felt as having no immediate relation to the rest of the paradigm, and could then be reinterpreted in the adjectival qualitative sense, and through what forces and in what manner the semantic differentiation between the originally identical pronominal and substantival forms of the genitive plural took place. These questions can not be answered in the identical way for all of the forms under discussion, since morphological as well as semantic conditions vary widely, and it will therefore be best to take up these adjectives one by one, beginning with ποῖος, which presents the most favorable conditions for such a differentiation from its primitive τῷς.

I. ποῖος⁷ : τῷς

In the interrogative pronoun the conditions for the isolation of cases were particularly favorable because from I. E. times its declension appears to have been heteroclitic, the stems *q^ue-*, *q^uo-*, *q^uā-*, and *q^ui-* alternating in such a way that we are unable to decide with certainty as to their distribution, except that it is probable that the nom. and acc. sing. had the stem *q^ui-*. Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* II. 2², 348 f. Since the I. E. labio-velars became dentals in Greek before palatal vowels, but otherwise labials, the difference between these various stems was increased further so that we have *τε- πο-*, *πā-* (Attic *πη-*), *τι-*. This resulted in casting out the forms with labials from the regular paradigm at a very early date, and already in Homer they are relegated to adverbs and derivatives like *πόθεν* and *ποῖος*, while the pronoun itself has retained *τι-* (*τιν-*) in the nom. and acc., but used *τε-* everywhere else, so that the paradigm appears as follows: N. S. *τῷς*, *τί*, G. *τέο* *τεῦ*, D. *τέω*, A. *τίνα*, N. Pl. *τίνες*, G. *τέων*, D. *τέουσι*, A. *τίνας*. Cf. Monro, *Hom. Gram.* 92. That, how-

⁷ Since *δοῖος* is merely a derivative of *ποῖος*, it will not receive special treatment.

ever, the gen. pl. was originally *ποίων* < **ποίσων*, I. E. **ǵʰoi-sōm* is made probable not only by the above-mentioned Skr. *kēṣām*, but also by the Oscan **poizōm* presupposed by the abl. sing. *poizad*. Such an irregular Gr. genitive could not maintain itself in its original function and either had to disappear or give rise to other analogical forms which supported it. After the substantival gen. pl. had once encroached on the pronominal, *ποίων* appeared by analogy to other genitives like *ὦν* : *ός* as belonging to a nom. sing. *ποῖος*, and this resulted ultimately in forming an entire new paradigm from the stem *ποιο-*, which at first differed in no way from *τίς*⁸ semantically. Gradually, however, the influence of the many adjectives in *-ιος*, *-ειος*, *-αιος*, and particularly those in *-οιος*, e.g. *ῥοῖος* : *ῥός*, *γελοῖος* : *γέλως*, caused *ποῖος* to become specialized so as to be practically (though never entirely) limited to adjectival use, whereas *τίς* oftenest appears as substantive, though it always is also frequently used as an adjective.

The original equivalence of *ποῖος* and *τίς* thus presupposed shows itself in historical times in a multitude of ways. Leaving out of account the fact that in Modern Greek⁹ *ποῖος* is *the* interrogative pronoun and has almost completely displaced *τίς*, a fact which might be considered an altogether secondary development, there are many indications that the semantic distinction between the two pronouns was not at any time very definite. Alongside of many instances in which *ποῖος* was certainly both adjectival and qualitative there are many others from Homer on which show no clear cut distinction between the two pronouns.¹⁰ I give examples of evidence tending to prove this equivalence under three headings: (1) *ποῖος* is used substantively or without qualitative notion where *τίς* would have been at least equally applicable. (2) *τίς* is used adjectively or with the suggestion

⁸ One might compare the double paradigm of *Zeús*: on the one hand *Διός*, *Δί*, *Δία*, on the other hand *Ζηνός*, *Ζηνί*, *Ζήνα* after the old acc., which was originally **Zḡn*.

⁹ Cf. Hatzidakis, *Neugr. Gram.* 208.

¹⁰ Cf. also Jannaris, *Hist. Gr. Gr.* 163; Robertson, *Gram. of the Gr. N. Test.*

of a qualitative sense where ποῖος would have been normal. (3) ποῖος and τίς alternate in such a way in one and the same passage that it is evident that the writer could have felt no distinction between them.

As a substantive ποῖος occurs in the Homeric phrases ποῖον ἔειπες 'what have you said!' and ποῖον ἔρεξας 'what have you done!' It is true that in some instances there is certainly a qualitative notion present, so that we can hardly consider the substantival use a remnant of the original state of affairs, but rather a secondary substantivation from the qualitative adjective. So *e.g.* β, 243, Μέντορ ἀταρτηρέ, φρένας ἤλεέ, ποῖον ἔειπες 'Ἡμέας ὀτρύνων καταπανέμεν.¹¹ At other times, however, it seems as though the distinct qualitative notion is absent, as when Menelaos addresses Antilochus, Ψ, 570, 'Αντίλοχε, πρόσθεν πεπνυμένε, ποῖον ἔρεξας. Here 'what have you done!' seems more natural than 'what sort of a thing have you done!' though we must beware of judging from the English standpoint, as well as from the meanings to which we are accustomed from the lexicons. But such passages do show that the qualitative sense may be merely suggested by the context without our being justified in attributing the same to this word any more than to the simple τίς, which may be used in its stead and which by itself has certainly no qualitative sense. This is still more enlightening in some instances where ποῖος is indeed adjectival, but where the context shows that the qualitative notion is absent. In asking a stranger about his country one surely does not ask at first "what is the nature of the country from which you come?" but asks for its name, yet we find α, 406, 'Οππόθεν οὗτος ἀνὴρ· ποίης δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι Γαίης; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρὶς ἄρουρα; With this we may compare the use of τίς, ν, 233, Τίς γῆ, τίς δῆμος; τίνες ἄνδρες ἐγγεγάασιν; a question asked by Odysseus when he failed to recognize Ithaca on his return home and his awakening from deep sleep. Again when Telemachus asks

¹¹ Even here, however, the qualitative notion may be entirely suggested by the exclamatory nature of the passage and would have been present just as well if τί had been substituted.

Odysseus in π, 222, Ποίη γὰρ νῦν δεῦρο . . . νηί σε ναῦται Ἥγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; it would be superfluous to seek for a real qualitative notion. In later literature the qualitative notion must certainly be absent when ποῖος is used while sarcastically repeating a word of a preceding speaker, e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 62, where the herald announces the messengers from the King, and Dicaeopolis answers ποίου βασιλέως; 'what king?' surely not 'what sort of a king?' Cf. also *ib.* 157, ΘΕ. Ὀδομάντων στρατός. ΔΙ. ποίων Ὀδομάντων; ποῖος is furthermore used in Alexis, frg. 3, 386 (v. 3) when inquiring about the exact wording of a quotation: κομψόν γε τοῦτ' ἐστὶν . . . δεξιῶς θ' εὐρημένον. Σ. τὸ ποῖον; Α. ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις οὐ πίνεται ἄκρατον.

On the other hand, the qualitative sense can be read into τίς and was no doubt often suggested by the context in the large majority of instances in which it was used adjectivally. I quote the following from Homer: ν, 200, ὦμοι ἐγώ, τέων αὐτε βροτῶν ἐς γαίαν ἰκάνω; α, 225, Τίς δαίς, τίς δὲ ὄμιλος ὃδ' ἔπλετο; Ω, 367, τίς ἂν δῆ τοι νόος εἴη; Ε, 633, τίς τοι ἀνάγκη Πτώσσειν; λ, 171, Τίς νύ σε κῆρ ἐδάμασσε τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο; ω, 514, τίς νύ μοι ἡμέρη ἦδε; γ, 249, τίνα δ' αὐτῷ μήσατ' ὄλεθρον Αἴγισθος δολόμητις, ἐπεὶ κτάνε πολλὸν ἀρείω; π, 461, τί δὴ κλέος ἔστ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ;

Examples of alternation of ποῖος and τίς without distinction in the same passage are given by Jannaris, *Hist. Gr. Gr.* p. 163, and Hatzidakis, *Neugr. Gram.* 207 f. Of these I shall quote Eur. *El.* 907, Εἰεν· τίς ἀρχὴν πρῶτά σ' ἐξείπω κακῶν, Ποίας τελευτάς; τίνα μέσον τάξω λόγον; and Lycurgus, 143 f., ὑμεῖς δ' ἐρωτᾶτε αὐτὸν ποίους; . . . ἐν τοῖς τείχεσι τοῖς πατρίδος· ποίοις; τοὺς θεοὺς σώσοντας ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων· τίνας; . . . ἰκετεύσει ἐλεῆσαι αὐτόν· τίνων; . . . Ποία δ' ἡλικία δικαίως ἂν τοῦτον ἐλεήσει; πότερον ἢ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων . . . ; ἀλλ' ἢ τῶν νεωτέρων; καὶ τίς ἂν ἀναμνησθεῖς . . . ; Cf. also Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 1124, Ἔργον μεριμνῶν ποῖον ἢ βίον τίνα; *ib.* 1164, Τίνος πολιτῶν τῶνδε κακ ποίας στέγης; and Anaxandr. frg. 3, 184, τί γὰρ ἐκλείπει Δόμος ἡμέτερος ποίων ἀγαθῶν;

It thus appears that the distinction between ποῖος and τίς was never an absolute one, but that there merely was a tendency

to use the former as a qualitative adjective in the earlier classical period, from which, however, the latter was never excluded, and this distinction never became complete, but was obliterated again so that in Modern Greek *ποῖος* does service for both. How this tendency to use the longer word in the qualitative sense arose, is not hard to see. We surmised above that the distinction was originally rather that of substantive and adjective, *ποῖος* being appropriated for the latter purpose because of its ending, which seemed so much like adjectival suffixes. But since an adjectival interrogative pronoun, as is shown by the examples of adjectival *τίς* also, may in most instances give a suggestion of a qualitative meaning, which belonged in the beginning to the adjectival use itself, it is evident that the development of the adjectival interrogative into a qualitative interrogative was just what might have been expected. We may say then that from a semantic point of view also the derivation of *ποῖος* from the old gen. pl. **ποίων* : *τίς* is perfectly natural and adds weight to the other reasons given above for assuming this origin.

2. οἷος : ὅς

Here we have no breaking up of an originally unified paradigm to assist in the isolation of the genitive plural, but if *ποῖος* was once formed on the basis of its genitive plural which it had inherited from *τίς*, the existence of this paradigm would be a strong force to help reinterpret the genitives *οἷων* and *τοίων* as adjectival and qualitative and to cause double paradigms to be formed in their case also. It is only necessary to show that *οἷος* and *ὅς* had a part of their sphere of usage in common, so that the divergence from an original unity can be explained in exactly the same way as for *ποῖος* and *τίς*.

This original identity of the two relative pronouns, then, appears in the first place from passages in which *οἷος* is used substantively and non-qualitatively, or where we might rather expect *ὅς*. Thus in the following three instances it refers to something so definite that we would hardly seek for the qual-

itative notion, though it might be read into the passages: E, 340, ῥέε δ' ἄμβροτον αἶμα θεοῖο, Ἰχώρ, οἷός περ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν. B, 194, Ἐν βουλῇ δ' οὐ πάντες ἀκούσαμεν οἶον ἔειπε; δ, 242 (exclamatory), οἶον τόδ' ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ Δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων. Qualitative interpretation is practically impossible when οἷος is correlated with a non-qualitative demonstrative, as in the four following passages: I, 104, Οὐ γάρ τις νόον ἄλλος ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοήσει, Οἶον ἐγὼ νοέω. ξ, 443, Ἔσθιε . . . καὶ τέρπεο τοῖσδε, Οἷα πάρεστι. τ, 255, Αὐτὴ γὰρ τάδε εἴματ' ἐγὼ πόρον, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις. ω, 90, Ἀλλὰ τε κείνα μάλιστα ἰδὼν θηήσας θυμῷ, Οἷ' ἐπὶ σοὶ κατέθηκε θεὰ περικαλλέ' ἄεθλα.

On the other hand, since ὅς did not originally have an adjectival function, we need not seek for instances where it shows its original identity with οἷος through traces of such adjectival use, but there are a number of examples of its application in a general sense in such a way as to allow the qualitative notion to be read into it, and this would show how the originally identical οἷος got a starting point for that meaning which later became its principal one, largely through the assistance of its pattern ποῖος. I quote the following examples of ὅς qualitative: E, 304, ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ Τυδείδης, μέγα ἔργον, δ' οὐ δύο γ' ἄνδρες φέροιεν, οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἶσ'. 'Such as two men could not carry.' With οἷοι in the last part cf. the use of οἷ in an almost identical clause A, 272, κείνοισι δ' ἂν οὔ τις Τῶν οἷ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν ἐπιχθόνιοι μαχέοιτο. β, 119, Κέρδεα θ' οἷ' οὔ πώ τιν' ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν, Τάων αἰ πάρος ἦσαν ἐνπλοκαμίδες Ἀχαιοί (cf. οἷος, A, 262, Οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι Οἶον Πειρίθοον κ.τ.λ.). A, 62, Ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρέομεν ἢ ἱέρηα, ἥ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον. . . . Ὅς κ' εἶποι. β, 207, οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλας Ἐρχόμεθ', ὥς ἐπικέκς ὀπιούμεν ἐστὶν ἐκάστω. Ψ, 649, Τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι.

3. τοῖος : ὁ ἴ τὸ

Here also there was no breaking up of an originally unified paradigm, and in this respect the conditions for isolating the old genitive plural were less favorable than for ποῖων, but

they were better than for οἷων because the pronominal stem *το-* was from the beginning used adjectivally as well as substantivally, and it was the adjectival use, as we saw for *ποῖος*, that easily causes the development of the qualitative notion.

The original identity of *τοῖος* and *το-* is seen not so much from passages in which the former is used in a non-qualitative sense, in fact it is doubtful whether it was ever lacking in historical times, but we can at least quote a few sentences of a *type* which might *originally* have displayed a *τοῖος* which was felt as non-qualitative. This is most evident when it is correlated with the substantival non-qualitative relative *ὅς*, as in the following passages: Ψ, 280, Τοίου γὰρ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπώλεσαν ἡνιόχοιο, Ἡπίου, ὅς σφωιν μάλα πολλάκις ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον Χαϊτάων κατέχευε. Η, 231, Ἡμεῖς δ' εἰμὲν τοιοὶ οἱ ἂν σέθεν ἀντιάσαιμεν. Ρ, 164, Τοίου γὰρ θεράπων πέφατ' ἀνέρος, ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος Ἀργείων. In the last instance, *e.g.*, we could translate either 'the servant of that man' or 'the servant of such a man has been slain, who is, etc.' Otherwise we may sometimes translate by a non-qualitative pronoun without therefore assuming that it was so felt by the Greeks. Thus β, 60, Ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ νύ τι τοιοὶ ἀμυνόμεν can be translated either 'we are not such as to ward off' or 'those to ward off,' but the qualitative notion is suggested by the context if it is not expressed.

This leads us to the more frequent case, when the simple Greek demonstrative may suggest a qualitative notion through the context, and thus allow us to see the starting point for the development of the meaning of *τοῖος*. Most easily again this is seen when it is correlated with the qualitative *οἶος*. So Σ, 590, Ἐν δὲ χορὸν ποίκιλλε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις, Τῷ ἔκελον οἶόν ποτ' . . . Δαίδαλος ἤσκησεν. π, 288, οὐκέτι τοῖσιν ἐρῶκει Οἶά ποτε Τροίηνδε κίων κατέλειπεν Ὀδυσσεύς. Also note the parallelism of the pairs *τοῖος* : *οἶος* and *τὰ* : *ἃ* in η, 312, τοῖος ἐὼν οἶός ἐσσι, τὰ τε φρονέων ἅ τ' ἐγὼ περ. Otherwise a qualitative force of *το-* may be suggested if it does not refer to a particular individual or individuals, but is used generally. Cf. *e.g.* I, 508, Ὅς μὲν τ' αἰδέσεται κόυρας Διδὸς ἄσσον ἰούσας,

Τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὤνησαν καὶ τ' ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο· Ὅς δέ κ' ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη, Λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίῳνα κιούσαι Τῷ Ἄτην ἅμ' ἔπεισθαι. Λ, 409, Ὅς δέ κ' ἀριστεύησι μάχῃ ἔνι, τὸν δὲ μάλα χρεὼ ἑστάμεναι κρατερῶς. θ, 161, Οὐ γάρ σ' οὐδέ, ξεῖνε, δαήμονι φωτὶ εἰσκω Ἀθλων, . . . Ἀλλὰ τῷ δς . . . Φόρτου τε μνήμων καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ἦσιν ὁδαίων Κερδέων θ' ἀρπαλέων. κ, 74, Οὐ γάρ μοι θέμις ἐστὶ κομιζέμεν οὐδ' ἀποπέμπειν Ἄνδρα τὸν δς κε θεοῖσιν ἀπέχθεται μακάρεσσιν. In the last passage the reference is to the individual Odysseus, it is true, but he represents a whole type, so that we may render 'such a man, who is, etc.'

4. ἄλλοις : ἄλλος

For ἄλλοιων as a prehistoric gen. pl. of ἄλλος we are unable to quote from other I. E. languages forms which are actually found, but some near relatives make it certain that such a genitive must have existed at one time. The Gothic *aljis* must have had a gen. pl. *aljaiizē* fem. *aljaiizō* made like the corresponding forms of all other adjectives, and these would point to an I. E. masc. gen. pl. **aljoisōm* even if the final vowel of the Greek masculine cannot be immediately compared with the *ē* of the Gothic. Furthermore I. E. **aljoisōm* is made probable by the Skr. *anyēsām*, gen. pl. of *anyās*. While the Sanskrit has lost the pronoun directly descended from I. E. **aljos* which would correspond to Gr. ἄλλος Lat. *alius* Goth. *aljis*, I take it that *anyās*, which has no counterpart outside the Aryan, is a result of contamination of the synonyms *ántaras* Goth. *anþar* Lith. *ántras* and an Aryan **alyas* from I. E. **aljos*; i.e. the latter changed *y* to *n* under the influence of the former. Thus *anyēsām* would be the representative of I. E. **aljoisōm* and would be evidence of the prehistoric age of the Gr. ἄλλοιων as gen. pl. of ἄλλος. Finally, the fact that the adjective Lat. *alius* is inflected pronominally throughout, as is also Gr. ἄλλος (cf. e.g. Lat. *aliud*, Gr. ἄλλο, nom. acc. sing. neut.), would make it certain that the pronominal form of the gen. pl. masc. neut. must also have existed in the Indo-European, and that this form became isolated in Greek like *ποίων*, etc.

Since the ordinary function of ἄλλος is adjectival, the semantic distinction between it and ἄλλοιός is comparatively slight, in fact the former can always be used instead of the latter; for the qualitative notion can at any time be suggested by the context, just as in other adjectives, particularly when the reference is a general one. This is best shown by a passage in which ἄλλοιός and ἄλλος alternate in precisely the same sense: π, 181, 'Ἀλλοιός μοι, ξεῖνε, φάνης νέον ἢ παρόιθεν, Ἄλλα δὲ εἴματ' ἔχεις, καὶ τοι χρώς οὐκέθ' ὁμοίος. Cf. also Δ, 258, 'Ἡμὲν ἐνὶ πτολέμῳ ἦδ' ἄλλοιφ' ἐπὶ ἔργῳ with ξ, 228, Ἄλλος γάρ τ' ἄλλοισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργοις. For the third Homeric passage (τ, 265, Καὶ γάρ τίς τ' ἄλλοιόν ὀδύρεται ἀνδρ' ὀλέσασα Κουρίδιον . . . Ἡ Ὀδυσῆ') I can quote no exact parallel with ἄλλος, but surely ἄλλοιός here is no more qualitative than ἄλλη in τ, 175, Ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη.

5. ὅμοιος : ὁμός

For ὁμοίων as gen. pl. of ὁμός we have a certain corresponding form in O.Blg. *samēchъ*, gen. pl. of *samъ* 'self,' except for the lengthened root-vowel of the latter. Formally also would correspond the Skr. *samēṣām*, gen. pl. of the enclitic *sama-s* 'any one,' while *samā-s* 'the same,' which would correspond semantically with the Greek word, forms its gen. pl. nominally.¹² If the two are identical in origin, however, we may adduce the pronominal genitive of the indefinite pronoun as evidence for the I. E. age of ὁμοίων, even though *samā-s* probably has the weak root of Goth. *sums*.

On the semantic side the origin of ὅμοιος from ὁμοίων,¹³ gen. pl. of ὁμός, is easily understood by a comparison of the extant uses. On the one hand the adjective ὁμός 'same' could be used of sameness of quality, i.e. as a synonym of ὅμοιος, just as well as of absolute identity. Cf. e.g. Δ, 437, Οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμός θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς, Ἄλλα γλῶσσ'

¹² Cf. Thumb, *Handb. d. Skt.* 257.

¹³ Why the accent of this word was originally ὅμοιος as opposed to ἄλλοιός and παντοῖός does not concern us here, particularly since the gen. pl. had to be paroxytone regardless of the nom. sing.

ἐμέμικτο. Ο, 209, 'Οππότ' ἂν ἰσόμορον καὶ ὁμῇ πεπρωμένον αἴσῃ Νεικείειν ἐθέλῃσι. ρ, 563, Οἶδα γὰρ εὖ περὶ κείνου, ὁμῇ δ' ἀνεδέγμεθ' ὀλίζυν.¹⁴ On the other hand, ὁμοιος, which later completely displaced ὁμός, could also at any time be used of complete identity, thus showing that there never was an absolute distinction, but merely a tendency to differentiate, which could of course be easily explained by the influence of the other words in -ιος. For ὁμοιος in the meaning 'same' cf. Σ, 329, "Ἀμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίην γαίαν ἐρεῦσαι Αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ. Α, 278, οὐ ποθ' ὁμοίης ἔμμορε τιμῆς Σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεὺς. π, 182, "Ἄλλα δὲ εἴματ' ἔχεις, καὶ τοι χρὸς οὐκέθ' ὁμοίος. Antiphon, 5, 76, τὴν μὲν οὖν γνώμην ἔτι καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις ὁμοιος ἦν εἰς ὑμᾶς, τὴν δὲ εὖνοιαν οὐκέτι ἦν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τὴν αὐτὴν εἰς ὑμᾶς παρέχεσθαι.

6. παντοῖος : πᾶς

Since the primitive πᾶς (stem παντ-) is not an *o*-stem, the derivative παντοῖος could not possibly be explained as built upon the gen. pl. παντοίων, which in no form could ever have been gen. of πᾶς. παντοῖος is therefore the latest of the pronominal derivatives in -ιος, and is formed by analogy to the others. It is equally true that its semantic development consequently could not have been independent, and we therefore dismiss it without quoting any passages to show its use. The fact that its meaning closely associated it with the other pronominal adjectives is sufficient cause why it should have been the only one of these pronominal adjectives in -ιος which is not derived from an *o*-stem.

In conclusion I may summarize as follows: With the exception of the palpably later analogical formation παντοῖος all the pronominal adjectives in -ιος have for their genitive plural forms which according to the evidence of cognate languages seem to have been originally the gen. pl. of the primitive pronouns, which forms were for different reasons

¹⁴ For the development of the meaning 'of the same kind' from 'same' cf. the use of αὐτός in Xen. *An.* IV, 5, 31, οὐκ ἦν δ' ὅπου οὐ παρτίθεσαν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τράπεζαν κρέα ἄρνεα, ἐρίφεια κ.τ.λ.

isolated from their paradigms and were made the basis of the new derivative paradigms. That this was the origin of the derivatives in *-οιος* is further confirmed by the fact that the semantic distinction between the primitive pronoun and the derivative normally qualitative adjective is in no case absolute, but there are continual traces of original semantic identity.